DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 133 PS 014 128

TITLE Hearing to Restore Eligibility in the Special Milk Program. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session on H.R. 904 to Amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to Eliminate Certain Restrictions on the Eligibility of Schools to Participate in the Special Milk Program.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 23 Mar 83

NOTE 21p.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Children; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Nutrition; Program Costs; Public Schools

IDENTIFIERS Congress 98th; *Special Milk Program

ABSTRACT

On March 23, 1983, testimony was heard concerning H.R. 904, a bill amending the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to eliminate certain restrictions on the eligibility of schools to participate in the Special Milk Program. Included in this brief publication are statements focusing on (1) the "false economy" of not providing surplus milk to children; (2) consequences of the Reconciliation Act of 1981, which made any school offering the school lunch or breakfast program ineligible to participate in the Special Milk Program; (3) the drop in number of half pints served and the decrease in outlets for the Special Milk Program; and (4) the impact of federal budget cuts on the Massachusetts nutrition program and the related experience of the school food service in the Arlington, Massachusetts, public schools. Also included is a statement by the National Dairy Council detailing nutritional contributions of the Special Milk Program. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HEARING TO RESTORE ELIGIBILITY IN THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

PS

ED241133

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 904

TO AMEND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966 TO ELIMINATE CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON THE ELIGIBILITY OF SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on March 23, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

PS 0141128

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
22-772 O WASHINGTON : 1983

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (Bill) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
(Vacancy)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
RON PACKARD, California
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois,
Ex Officio
(Vacancy)

82 0 87

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C. on March 23, 1983	1
Text of H.R. 904	2
Statement of:	
Fridy, Susan, director of consumer and nutrition programs, National Milk Producers	3
Isaia, Patricia, R.D., M.S., director, School Food Service, Arlington Public Schools, Massachusetts	8
Traxler, Hon. Robert, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan	4
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:	
Isaia, Patricia J. S., R.D., M.S., director, Arlington School Food Service, Arlington, Mass.:	
"Fact sheet, Massachusetts Nutrition Programs, Impact of Federal Budget Cuts," (table)	12
"Guest Column," article entitled	13
Prepared statement of	10
National Dairy Council, division of nutrition research, "The Nutritional Contributions of the Special Milk Program," article entitled	14
Traxler, Hon. Robert, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, prepared statement of	4

HEARING TO RESTORE ELIGIBILITY IN THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., March 23, 1983, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Parkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Member present: Representative Perkins.

Staff present, John F. Jennings, counsel; and Beatrice Clay, legislative specialist.

[Text of H.R. 904 follows:]

98TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 904

To amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to eliminate certain restrictions on the eligibility of schools to participate in the Special Milk Program.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 25, 1983

Mr. TRAXLER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to eliminate certain restrictions on the eligibility of schools to participate in the Special Milk Program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772) is amended—

(1) by striking out all of subsection (b);

(2) by striking out "(a)" after "SEC. 3."; and

(3) by striking out "which do not participate in a meal service program authorized under this Act or the National School Lunch Act" each of the three times it appears in such section.

SEC. 2. Section 1 shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

O

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead and make your statement.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN FRIDY, DIRECTOR OF CONSUMER AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS, NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS

Ms. FRIDY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify on a bill to reestablish the special milk program. As you know, I am Susan Fridy and I am director of consumer and nutrition programs for the National Milk Producers Federation. We, of course, have supported the special milk program over the years.

I will later be presenting a formal statement for the record.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection your informal statement will be inserted in the record. Go ahead.

Ms. FRIDY. I would just like to make some brief comments about the program.

As you know, the special milk program for years operated as an effective and successful program to encourage fluid milk consumption by children in schools. It was a successful program. Unfortunately, with budget mania that we suffered a few years ago, we found that the Congress decided to cut back the program to schools that had any other nutrition program.

And a lot of false arguments were made against the special milk program, accusing it of providing too much milk to children and saying that too much waste had occurred because of the special milk program.

Well, we've tried the experiment of cutting back on the special milk program and I think now we've come to the conclusion that we cannot afford to carry on this experiment any longer.

Our dairies report to us that fluid milk consumption in schools has dropped from 20 to 25 percent on average, and this is really amounting to a disaster for children. Milk is an essential item in a child's diet. It's very difficult for children to get the proper amount of calcium, phosphorus, and riboflavin without milk, and that isn't even documenting the other valuable food components of milk such as protein, and vitamin A. The list is endless. And really the thought that milk is nature's most perfect food is really—carries a great deal of truth.

As a nutrition program, the special milk program is of a modest cost. And I think one of the things we have to keep in mind is that the money that is spent on special milk does two jobs. It encourages milk consumption by children, which is so important for their growth and development, and it also assists dairy producers.

Just now the House Agriculture Committee is sitting in hearings, working on the price support program to cut back on our surplus, and we do have a surplus. It does not make sense to continue to withdraw the special milk program and keep it from children at the time that we are purchasing so many dairy products and storing them in Government warehouses.

Now, as you know, we support the commodity distribution program. It's an important element of our agricultural and our nutrition policy.

But let's look a minute at the false economy of not providing this fluid milk to children.

Congressman Traxler's bill would reinstate a 5-cent-per-half-pint encouragement to children to consume special milk. Since that 5 cents was deleted we found a number of things happened in schools. One of them was that the price of milk did not merely go up by 5 cents. Schools, relieved of the constriction by the Federal Government of earning a profit, have unduly enhanced the price of milk to children.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me interrupt you. Congressman Traxler is here at the present time. Come on around and you can make your statement right now, Mr. Traxler. We're glad to welcome you here this morning.

Susan is before the committee quite often and she will not mind being interrupted. So go right ahead.

Ms. FRIDY. That's certainly right. I would always defer to you, Mr. Traxler.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. BOB TRAXLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. TRAXLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would only do this with Susan's kind consent. She's been an eloquent spokesperson for the dairy industry and a very good friend of mine and only because the Chair insists will I go ahead.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee——

Chairman PERKINS. All of the remarks, the prepared remarks, will be inserted in the record.

Go right ahead.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Bob Traxler follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BOB TRAXLER

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, I want to thank you for taking this time today to hold special hearings on my bill, H.R. 904, which would restore the eligibility of all schools to operate the special milk program, regardless of whether or not they already operate a school lunch or breakfast program. My bill seeks to undo what had been done to an important child nutrition program by certain provisions of the Reconciliation Act of 1981, a piece of legislation which I firmly believe tarnishes the image of Congress as a deliberative body.

The Reconcilation bill, which I along with many of you opposed, made any school which offered the school lunch or breakfast program ineligible to offer the special milk program. Why? Because someone thought that one carton of milk in school each day was enough.

Mr. Chairman, no one can deny that it is a laudable goal to get as many schools as possible to offer the school lunch and school breakfast program. But absolutely no one has yet answered succesfully one of the key questions about the special milk program: What is wrong with one more half-pint of milk per day?

As a result of the Reconciliation Act, special milk was offered at only 9,968 outlets in fiscal 1982 compared to 88,613 outlets in fiscal 1981. We have gone from providing 9.6 million half-pints of milk per day to just over 1 million half-pints of milk per day.

And while all of this is happening, not a day goes by that we do not hear another complaint about the level of surplus dairy products owned by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, even as we meet here, the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee is meeting to once again modify the dairy price support program so as to encourage a reduction in the amount of milk produced.

The restriction of the special milk program has had many consequences. One of the most dramatic ones has been that kindergarten and special education students are getting no nutritional assistance at all. The reason for this result is very simple. Kindergarten and special education students are usually not in school during regularly scheduled meal times. Because the school offers a lunch or a breakfast program, the school is prohibited from even offering special milk to these students who are getting no benefit from the regular meal programs.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is further aggravated in Michigan by the fact that the State requires all public school districts to offer a lunch program. Eleven school districts in the State have had this requirement waived because of severe financial constraints, but effectively the point is that no kindergarten or special education student in Michigan can get the benefits of the special milk program, at a time when State nutritionists tell me that they believe that many young children should be drinking four half-pints of milk per day. It is also at a time when these same nutritionists also tell me that they are concerned that with unemployment as high as it is in Michigan, families have cut back on the purchase of items like milk because they see by unit pricing that some other beverages, like Kool-Aid, may be cheaper.

This Committee has long been committed to providing children with excellent nutrition programs. You know full well the documented history of programs like the Women, Infants and Children program which has shown that spending money on good nutrition can save multiples in health costs later. Yet in order to save relatively small amounts by reducing support for this special milk program, we may be running the risk of creating larger concerns in the future.

H.R. 904 would restore the reduced and free reimbursement rate at 5 cents per half-pint for milk served to paying children in schools and other institutions which participate in another federally subsidized food service program. Those students who are eligible for the program would have a choice as to whether or not to accept the milk, maintaining the highly successful format of "offer v. serve" that has substantially reduced waste in the school lunch program.

In the truest spirit of the new Federalism, schools would be able to decide for themselves whether or not they wanted to offer the special milk program, rather than have their eligibility dictated by the participation or non-participation in another school feeding program.

The Michigan Department of Education, saw the number of participating outlets drop from 6,621 outlets in fiscal 1981 to 762 outlets in fiscal 1982. We have had one of the highest unemployment rates in the nation, and Michigan's children need good nutrition just as much as children who live in other areas of the country. The Michigan Department of Education would like to make special milk available to all those schools that would like to offer it. I would like them to have the chance to do this.

The Congressional Budget Office has informed my office that it would probably cost about $80 million in fiscal 1984 to restore the special milk program to its former eligibility. This means that the total appropriation for the program would have to be $91 million in fiscal 1984, including USDA's current request. I believe this amount to be a reasonable approximation, even though the history of the program shows that in fiscal 1981, before the Reconciliation provisions were in effect, the appropriation for this program was $118.8 million. The lower amount is expected to be reasonable because of the combined factors of the usual time that it would take for this program to resume its former stature, as well as the fact that the number of meals served by schools has actually declined over the past two years as a result of other modifications in child nutrition programs.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, as a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee I can tell you with confidence that we stand ready to work with you to provide the appropriate level of assistance for all child nutrition programs. We need your help to overcome the stumbling block created by the 1981 Reconciliation Act which took milk away from children who might not otherwise receive any. I believe that my bill is a step in that direction, and I hope you will favorably report it to the full House in the very near future.

TABLE 1.—*Special milk program appropriations*

[Fiscal years]

1975	$125,000,000
1976	168,000,000
1977	155,000,000
1978	155,000,000
1979	142,000,000
1980	146,800,000
1981	118,800,000
1982	28,100,000
1983	20,100,000

Source: House Appropriations Committee.

TABLE 2.—NUMBER OF HALF PINTS SERVED

Fiscal year	Free	Paid	Total
1978	357,136,000	1,654,719,000	2,011,855,000
1979	231,992,000	1,629,794,000	1,861,786,000
1980	240,560,000	1,611,183,000	1,851,743,000
1981	222,174,000	1,385,665,000	1,607,839,000
1982	12,553,000	194,667,000	207,220,000

TABLE 3.—OUTLETS FOR SPECIAL MILK

Fiscal year	Schools	Nonresident child care institutions	Summer camps	Total
1978	84,978	1,033	3,067	89,078
1979[1]	83,846	1,078	3,306	88,230
1980	85,364	1,011	2,683	89,058
1981	84,641	1,061	2,911	88,613
1982	6,595	1,023	2,350	9,968

[1] Provided by the budget office of the food and nutrition service. Not included in the annual budget justification for fiscal 1980.
Source: USDA annual budget justifications since fiscal 1979, for both tables 2 and 3.

Mr. TRAXLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to especially thank you and members of the subcommittee for holding this special hearing on H.R. 904 which restores the eligibility of all schools to operate the special milk program, regardless of whether or not they already operate a school lunch or a breakfast program.

The bill seeks to undo what has been done to an important child nutrition program by certain provisions of the Reconciliation Act of 1981. The reconciliation bill which many of us were opposed to made any school which offered the school lunch or breakfast program ineligible to offer the special milk program, and we could ask why. My judgment is that someone thought that one carton of milk in school each day was enough, but I can't believe and I don't accept that.

My judgment is that we ought to have as many schools as possible offer the school lunch and the school breakfast program but no one has yet answered successfully one of the key questions about the special milk program: What's wrong with more than one-half pint of milk per day? In fact, when I was a youth, and that wasn't too recent, but it was a quart of milk a day that was recommended, and I think that I had probably more than that.

As a result of the act, the special milk was offered at only 9,968 outlets in fiscal 1982 compared to 88,613 outlets in fiscal 1981. We have gone from providing 9.6 million half pints of milk per day to just over 1 million half pints of milk per day, a dramatic reduction.

While all this is happening, not a day goes by that we don't hear another complaint about the level of dairy surplus products that are being accumulated and owned by the Department of Agriculture.

Restriction of the special milk program has had many consequences and one of the most dramatic ones has been the kindergarten and special education students are getting no nutritional assistance at all, and the reason for this result is very simple. Kinder-

garten and special education students are usually not in school during the regularly scheduled mealtimes and because the school offers a lunch or a breakfast program, the school, under the 1981 reconciliation bill, is prohibited from offering even the special milk to these students who are getting no benefit from the regular meal program.

The problem, therefore, Mr. Chairman, is further aggravated in Michigan by the fact that the State requires all public schools in my State to offer a lunch program. Eleven school districts in the State have had this requirement waived because of severe financial constraints, but effectively the point is that no kindergarten or special education student in my State can get the benefits of the special milk program, at a time when our State nutritionists tell us that they believe that many young children should be drinking four half pints of milk per day.

It's also at a time when these same nutritionalists also tell us that they are concerned with high unemployment, as in our State, and families have cut back on the purchase of items such as milk because they see by unit pricing some other beverages, such as Kool-Aid, may be cheaper. It's hard to believe but it is a fact.

This committee has long been committed to providing children with an excellent nutrition program and you know full well the documented history of programs like the women, infants, and children program which has shown that spending money on good nutrition can save multiples in health care costs later on. Yet, in order to save relatively small amounts by reducing the support for the special milk program we are running the risk of creating larger concerns in the future.

So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the subcommittee would give serious consideration to acting favorably on H.R. 904 and that the full committee would also look with favor upon it.

My additional remarks, and I know that you will be inserting them in the record, and for that I'm very grateful.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment you on your statement. That dropoff from participation and drinking milk is tremendous. I never dreamed it was that high, myself.

But when we are derelict in our responsibility and don't make appropriations for milk, that means that the school lunch children and all the feeding programs, elderly and everybody else, are not going to have a nutritious meal. The youngsters especially will run to the machines and drink pop and something sweet, which in most instances is not good for them, very detrimental to their welfare.

We are going to do our best, Congressman Traxler, to straighten this situation out this year. We hope we will be successful.

Thank you very much for coming here today.

Mr. TRAXLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you for coming this morning.

Mr. TRAXLER. Thank you, Susan.

Chairman PERKINS. Susan, do you have somebody else to introduce? Go right ahead and introduce the lady. We have got to get away from here this morning.

Ms. FRIDY. I would like to just take a minute to go over the cost comparisons.

Chairman PERKINS. All right; go ahead.

Ms. FRIDY. The Federal input per half pint is a nickel. For 2 half pints it equals a pound of milk. Now, if—so therefore 200 half pints equal a hundredweight of milk, which is the measure that farm production is calculated on.

The Federal Government purchases surplus milk at $13.10 a hundredweight. By the time they store it, process it, and get it in the Government warehouses, a hundredweight of milk costs the Federal Government $15. The special milk program, which will instead of putting this milk in Government warehouses, put it in the tummies of children, will cost only $10 a hundredweight, and I think you can see that this is a cost-effective program.

I know that you're short of time. I have some other points which we will make for the record.

Chairman PERKINS. But you've got your statement in the record, all of it.

Ms. FRIDY. It will be in the record early next week.

Chairman PERKINS. All right. You will get it all in the record.

Ms. FRIDY. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, we'll hear the other witness. Are you a nutritionist?

Ms. ISAIA. Am I what, sir?

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead and identify yourself and proceed.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA ISAIA, R.D., M.S., DIRECTOR, SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE, ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MASSACHUSETTS

Ms. ISAIA. I am Pat Isaia. I am a registered dietician and also the director of Arlington School Food Service in Massachusetts, and I come to you—I feel very honored to be here at all today and have been with you in the past.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, your prepared statement will be inserted in the record and you proceed and go right along.

Ms. ISAIA. I am so much in agreement with what Congressman Traxler has just said and I can cite statistics in our own operation that flow exactly with what he is saying.

To state that 600—looking at the figures that he cited, 2 years ago we had a consumption of 600,000 cartons of milk each day, or for the year. A year later, after the first nickel was removed from the special milk program, our consumption dropped to 300,000 cartons for the year. That's a 50-percent reduction. And that is a nationwide kind of a figure, although those are our own statistics.

This current year we're only experiencing a 20-percent participation in milk at all, and that consumption. Because of these kinds of drastic cuts this September, when our former milk company came in, who was just a local distributor and processor, came in and handed me his keys because he lost the bid. He had lost so much milk in the previous year he lost the bid this year to a greater company who underbid, so that he was essentially going out of business because he lost our business, because we're a middle-sized school. We're not big and we're not small. But we're representative, I think, of the size school across the country.

And it bothered me a great deal to see him lose.

I see the children in kindergarten not drinking milk at all. The numbers that I see on our records every day are void of milk by

the kindergarten kids, because they are not there for milk and they have no other programs offered. I was just in a kindergarten class last Wednesday and I saw them bringing in drinks and what are drinks but sugar water, that's all, colored, to be any color, any flavor you can think of it is that color and that's the way they drink it.

I'm seeing that when else are these kids going to learn if not in school? Nobody has formal nutrition classes. I did. I was fortunate. But normally people do not, and this is the only place in time from kindergarten through grade 12 that we can teach these kids how to eat and what to be drinking.

We are seeing osteoparosis in the elders. It's a fact and research is showing that women after menopause are showing great amounts of osteoparosis because they have not been drinking calcium, or having calcium in their bodies over time.

This is not a curable thing. But it is preventative. If we are encouraging and teaching our children to drink milk then we will be preventing osteoparosis in the elder years. When people break their bones, that are old, and they say, "Oh, they're brittle because they're old," they're not. It's because they don't have calcium. They are brittle because they don't have calcium. They'd mend quite readily, even if they are older.

So that we need—I am very strongly opposed to not having a special milk program. It's one of the finest programs we have had that reaches all children.

One of my principals the other day said to me, I gave her the milk cooler key because kids come into school and have a headache. She's been giving them a carton of milk. Their headache goes away and they no longer have to go home for a headache because they haven't drunk or ate anything for the day.

These are the kinds of things that this milk program is doing.

The nurse came in the other day to me and said, "What can you do for this child who doesn't have a milk? Her sister is saving it from her lunch. She's on a free milk and that program is no longer. Her sister is saving it in the upper grade for her to have in the kindergarten but then she's voided the milk." So somebody has to pay for this milk. Well, it's coming out of my pocket; that's where it's coming from, instead out of the free milk program.

Another thing that bothers me is that for the nickel per half carton it only costs us $1 to feed 20 different children that carton of milk. It also costs $1.45 to convert that same 20 cartons of milk into a pound of cheese that we then have to store, after being processed, and distribute. And it just is a matter of false econonomy to me to see this happening. We have too much cheese.

I love the commodity program. It's a wonderful program for the school in the way it's being used. But to have all this cheese, we have too much, to not have the kids drinking the milk in its natural form when it's an excellent food. God knew what he was doing when he put together milk. He put together the right amount of phosphorus and calcium so that the phosphorus would work with the calcium.

When somebody alters food and some chemist decides what proportions of known nutrients were going into food, this is a very strange thing for me to comprehend. Why can't we leave the food

as it is because there are all kinds of little nutrients in there working with other foods that we don't even know about, making one work with the other. God knew what he was doing when it came to balances.

I don't know what else to tell you at this point. I have never testified and I don't know if I've supplied you with the right information.

Chairman PERKINS. You've made a good statement and I think your statement is very clear and concise and your remarks will all be in the record.

We have in this budget resolution, we are adding $200 million, if we can hold it, that will certainly help this program, and let me compliment all of you for your attendance here this morning. Everything will be in the record. You've made a good record, and we will do our best to hold this figure in the budget and to add more to the milk program in the Agriculture Committee and in the agricultural appropriations this year and let me thank all of you for coming here this morning.

Ms. FRIDY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. ISAIA. Thank you.

Ms. FRIDY. Thank you for your leadership. We appreciate it.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will now recess.

[Whereupon, at 9:58 a.m., March 23, 1983, the committee recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Additional information follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PATRICIA J. S. ISAIA, R.D., M.S.[1]

It is with high honor that I appear before you and thank you for your continued support of the child nutrition programs. I am in total support of H.R. 904, Congressman Robert Traxler's bill, to reinstate the Special Milk Program. I have strong feelings for this bill which are supported by the hard facts.

Robert Recker, M.D., Assistant Professor of Medicine at Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, recently reported that research indicates that without calcium, women after menopause or greater than 50 years old, exhibit a profound degree of osteoporosis. This is not curable but it is preventable by a lifetime of calcium intake. Why do we merely accept the fact that an elder person is supposed to have brittle bones that break easily and heal poorly, passing it off as given as age advances?

Why do adults and especially senior adults have the idea that they should no longer be drinking milk? Why are we spending millions of dollars in Medicare and Medicaid when minimal dollars could be spent in preventive medicine? How many people are formally and properly educated in nutrition? What better time to teach proper eating habits than when people are children? What better place to teach but in the existing learning establishment—the school?

Consider the following: Twenty 8-oz. cartons of milk are converted to 1 pound of cheese at approximately $1.45. In addition, $0.036 is spent to store that same pound of cheese, Further, distribution costs must be added. Conversely, the same 20 cartons of milk at 5 cents per 8-oz. carton (as is proposed in H.R. 904) would cost $1.00. Is this not a false sense of economics?

Why are we converting, processing, adding, and changing food composition and relying more and more on a chemist's proportion of only known nutrients? Why are we not keeping the milk whole and fluid and so easily and quickly consumed at a minimal cost as it was in the now defunct Special Milk Program? God knew what he was doing when he created food. For example, there is just the right amount of phosphorous in milk to enable assimilation of the amount of calcium contained therein. This is only one of the multiple correct proportions of balanced known and unknown nutrients existing within foodstuffs. This perfect balance of nutrients for

[1] Following is the written documentation for the verbal extemporaneous testimony I gave before the Honorable Carl Perkins, Chairman, and Jack Jennings, Counsel and Staff Director, House of Representatives.

proper assimilation of the whole is where I prefer to place my allegiance, trust, and health.

Concurring with the Honorable Mr. Traxler, we are overlooking our kindergarten children. Recently, a school nurse and kindergarten teacher came to me asking what we could do for a kindergarten child whose older sister was saving the milk from her approved free lunch to give to her kindergarten sister. Since there is no Special Milk Program for her, it now comes out of "my pocket." A principal in an elementary school is providing milk out of her "pocket" to children coming to school with headaches. Having consumed the milk, the headache is gone and a day in school is not lost.

During fiscal year 1981, the school children in Arlington consumed approximately 600,000 8-oz. cartons of milk. This consumption dropped to 300,000 in fiscal year 1982. This is obviously a 50-percent decrease. (We are currently at 24-percent participation.) How did this decrease effect the small business marketplace? In September of 1982, our local dairy owner came to my office with the keys to our milk coolers. Having just experienced our severe decline in milk consumption during the fiscal year and the loss of our bid to a dairy giant, he was giving up the processing of milk and essentially going out of business. This was a family-owned business with the most conscientious, concerned people giving us fine high quality service. Currently, we are forced to spend a great deal fo time resolving the large dairy incompetencies because of departmental bureaucracy. Is this productive? Having come from a family history of small business owners and seeing his facial expression, my heart cried out to him. It now cries out to you. This same picture can be repeated across this country. In Massachusetts we experienced a decline of 85 percent in milk consumption (See enclosed "Fact Sheet Massachusetts Nutrition Programs, Impact of Federal Budget Cuts"), and what are the children drinking instead? Traveling from school to school I am observing colored flavored sugar water under the title "drink" . . . carbonated beverages. Therefore, I urge the passage of H.R. 904 to restore the Special Milk Program in order to protect the health and well-being of our nation's children.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education
Bureau of Nutrition Education and School Food Services
1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Fact Sheet, Massachusetts Nutrition Programs
Impact of Federal Budget Cuts

School Lunch

	1980-81 School Year (Per Day)	1981-1982 School Year (Per Day)	% Increase/Decrease
Students Served	632,257	453,686	-29%
Paid Meals	410,669	261,116	-37%
Reduced Price Meals	34,[illegible]	28,392	-18%
Free Meals	187,311	164,178	-13%
Average Charge per Meal	.60	.75	+20%

School Breakfasts

Students Served	61,419	43,714	-29%
Paid Meals	11,692	4,693	-60%
Reduced Price Meals	1,798	1,065	-41%
Free Meals	47,929	37,956	-21%
Average Charge	.30	.40	+25%

Summer Feeding

Children Served	49,064	16,904	-66%

Special Milk

Children Served	353,538	54,273	-85%
Paid	325,595	51,166	-85%
Free	27,943	3,107	-89%

	1980-1981	1981-1982	% Change
Child Care			
Approved Programs	271	273	+1
Children Participating	24,856	28,501	+13
Federal Support for Nutrition	69,082,519	57,337,363	-18

FILMED FROM
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Arlington Advocate, Thursday, March 12, 1981

Guest Column

By Patricia Isola, R.D., M.S.

Director Of Arlington School Food Service

Ten years ago I would not have considered writing this since I had never eaten a "school lunch" nor had any exposure to the programs prior to that time. Since 1971, I have been converted. I now eat a school lunch every day. Let me share my transition from a skeptic to a believer.

Please congratulate President Reagan and his budget committee in all of their attempts to severely curtail, or better, eliminate any and all abuses in federally funded programs. However, I am opposed to zero budget proposals for the "paying child" in the Child Nutrition Programs and find this approach to be shortsighted.

We who forget the past will be condemned in the future. The child Nutrition Programs were originated in 1946. Lack of proper nutrition began the program. Do we want to go back? We are not in a 30 to 50 year ago society where at least one adult was in a household and many good nutrition habits were passed through the generations.

Today's society is a generation of "eat-on the run/snack foods." Not that these in themselves are poor foods, but they become so at the expense of sound nutrition habits.

Observe what the 60 percent of our students bring from home. Some lunch cans are of high quality (i.e. meet the School Lunch Pattern); many contain only a sandwich and baked dessert or chips; many contain only foods of high caloric value, but minimal nutrient value. I have seen the participation in the Arlington School Lunch Program steadily increase from 28.3 percent in 1972 to a current 66 percent. Other Arlington statistics follow:

	Number	Percent of Total
Total school lunches consumed a year	430,078	
Total paid student lunches a year	339,277	80.5
Total free student lunches a year	87,140	13.8
Total reduced student lunches a year	34,661	5.9

The tax savings projected to be incurred by the $20,000 income person would be immediately eaten for the forced increase in charge for lunch due to the proposed federal budget cuts in the same. This is illustrated:

Cost of each lunch to prepare (inflated for 1981-82)	at $1.30
Less State Reimbursement	.06
Less Local ala carte special functions	.26
	.06
Student pays	.52
Less present amount paid	.44
Balance to be paid	.08
X no. days a year	180
Additional monies spent by student per year	$14.40

This produces a snow ball or domino effect:

By doubling the price of a school lunch to the "Paying" child, we will virtually lose his or her participation in the program. Further this group of paying children will increase with the proposed change of income eligibility for the free and reduced price meals. Without the participation of the majority of our population, our program would not be able to operate at its current level. This would cause the following rippling effects:

Loss of jobs for 50 Arlington School Food Service employees. This loss would create unemployment payments of $96,250 and a loss of spending power of $350,000 a year in the general economy.

Loss of purchasing power of $418,900 in the general economy for food supplies and services presently expended annually for our program. This in turn would further intensify the nation's scarcity of a decreasing rate of production.

Magnifying the above to encompass the entire nation, it appears that we are working to replicate the automotive industry problems in the food service industry.

Let us not push the future generation, our children, aside so readily. Exposure to career opportunities in the living of ala school food service laboratory are immense. To name a few:

When touring various groups of children through our central kitchen:

A 2nd grader asks . . . But what makes the turntable turn? We begin examining the motor responsible. Is this a future engineer?

The child who is able to determine the next operation in a series of production events. Is he/she a future analyst?

Another child who gets involved with production records. Do we have a future accountant or production supervisor or management potential?

The letter writing before and after these tours are a practical real means of using writing and language skills along with the social graces of writing thank you letters.

Quantitative analysis: physics, food science, chemistry, nutrition questions relating to all of these areas, interviews with school newspaper editors, food photography, nutritional improvement, secretarial skill development, advertising, art, are but a few of the practical experience generated in our on-site working, living laboratory school Food Service. Do we want to destroy these secondary opportunities and benefits noted in school food service?

Undernourished children cannot learn; properly demonstrate behavior problems; incur greater dental and medical bills. Where are the savings realized when the above costs and losses are incurred?

Are we going to allow the previous years' federal monies invested in equipment through non-food assistance sit idle?

Therein lies the "waste" of school food service.

Is there any other federal program that reaches every public school (and many private school) children every day of the school year (lunch and/or milk) and gives an immediate benefit . . . food consumed for growth, repair and maintenance?

We do not have to wait or guess about the results for months or years. Hunger is immediately removed, malnourishment takes a little longer). Learning ability increases, behavior and attitude improve. What other programs can demonstrate this kind of success at such a small investment of $3.916 billion for the entire country of school children for an entire year?

I, who have no children, am very happy to have my tax dollars spent for such a successful program. This is one of the best investments I feel I can make for my future and for future generations.

Please do all you can to save the Child Nutrition Programs.

You are most welcome to come and join us for lunch at any time you are in the town of Arlington. Or come and visit our central kitchen at Thompson School for National Nutrition Month open house on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, March 16-18, from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. or 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

FILMED FROM
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE NUTRITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

National Dairy Council
Division of Nutrition Research
April 6, 1983

The Special Milk Program (SMP) is intended to encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children. This program, along with other federal child nutrition programs, is a nutritional measure taken to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children. Milk provided through the SMP contributes to the overall nutritional objectives of the federal child nutrition programs by increasing children's nutrient intakes and improving their overall nutritional status.

Background

In recent years, the SMP has experienced a drastic reduction in budget and scope. Originally slated for elimination at the federal level in 1983, the SMP was continued in fiscal year (FY) 1983 at about the same low level of funding. Since 1980, funding for the SMP has been decreasing. The largest cut occurred in FY 1982 when the SMP was limited to only those schools which did not participate in any other federal child nutrition program. Also starting in FY 1982, private schools with average yearly tuitions of greater than $1500 per child were not eligible for the SMP or other federal child nutrition programs. Another funding cut for the SMP has been proposed by the Administration for FY 1984. While a program level of $20.2 million is being proposed by the Administration for the SMP in FY 1984, only $11.9 million is actually new budget authority (1). The remainder, approximately $8.3 million, represents funds carried over from previous years. Congress is currently in the process of developing the first concurrent budget resolution for next year, and it is not yet known how the SMP will fare in the Congressional budget.

Some Congressional support for the SMP, however, is indicated by bills recently introduced in both bodies of Congress. S 302 was introduced by Michigan Senators Donald W. Riegle, Jr. and Carl Levin, and HR 904 was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Robert Traxler of Michigan. These bills would reinstate the SMP to all eligible schools, regardless of whether they participate in other federal child nutrition programs. Currently, proponents of these bills are attempting to gain additional Congressional cosponsors.

As legislation has decreased the size of the SMP budget, participation in the program and the amount of milk used have drooped accordingly. The following table shows the changes in these parameters in the SMP from FY 1980 through FY 1983 (1):

	1980	1981	1982	1983 (estimated)
federal costs (in millions)	$155.7	$119.8	$ 19.5	$ 20.2
institutions participating	86,000	85,000	10,000	10,000
half-pints of milk served (in millions)	1,796	1,542	228	210.

These data show that funding for the SMP from 1981 to 1983 dropped 83 percent, the number of institutions participating decreased by 88 percent, and the amount of milk served to children dropped by 86 percent or by about 1.3 billion half-pints annually. Thus, the nutritional benefits that would have been provided by this amount of milk through the SMP were no longer available to American school children in 1983.

Nutritional Value of Milk

Milk provides important amounts of many nutrients which are essential for health and optimal growth and development. For example, one 8-ounce glass of vitamin D-fortified milk, the amount children generally receive each day under the SMP, provides the following to the Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDA) (2) for a 7 to 10 year old child:

36% of the RDA for calcium
29% of the RDA for vitamin B_{12}
29% of the RDA for phosphorus
28% of the RDA for riboflavin
25% of the RDA for vitamin D
24% of the RDA for protein.

In addition, milk contributes magnesium, pantothenic acid, thiamin, vitamin A, vitamin B_6, and zinc as well as a number of other nutrients in lesaser amounts (3). Milk is a primary source of calcium in children's diets. Milk and milk products provide 68 to 72% of the calcium in the diets of school-age children (4). Without milk, it would be difficult for children to obtain enough dietary calcium to meet the RDA. Complementing the abundant amount of calcium supplied by milk are the favorable interactions between calcium and other components of milk which enhance calcium bioavailability and utilization in the body (5, 6).

The nutritional value of milk is especially important in view of one national dietary intake survey (7) which indicated that certain groups of children and teenagers had dietary calcium and magnesium intakes which were less than 80% of the RDA and another study (8) which showed that school-age girls over the age of of 11 years consumed less than 72% of the RDA for calcium. The USDA, as well as the National Dairy Council, recommend three daily servings of milk and milk products for children and four daily servings for teenagers (8, 9).

Milk is highly appealing to children and is one of the least wasted items in school meals (10). It is a convenient, ready-to-serve item that requires minimal handling and preparation. Certainly, a food that has the triple advantage of being nutritious, highly appealing, and convenient to serve should be emphasized, rather than de-emphasized, in child nutrition programs.

As people live longer, osteoporosis--an age-related bone disorder--is becoming more of a public health problem (11). Although much remains to be known about osteoporosis, it has been suggested that an effective preventive measure against this disorder is to build maximum bone density during the younger years (12,13). Provision of sufficient calcium to school-age children through milk and other dairy foods can play an important part in attaining maximum bone density during the years when bone development is occurring.

Need for the Special Milk Program

The importance of and need for the SMP are supported by data from a 1975 evaluation of the program by USDA (14). For example, children in schools that participated in the SMP and not the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) consumed 22 percent of their total daily milk intake at school. Further, students in schools which offered the SMP drank more milk than did students who did not have access to the SMP. In schools participating in the SMP, students consumed, on the average, 42% more milk at school and 10% more total milk per day than did students in schools not participating in the program.

Almost all the milk served under the SMP is consumed and is not wasted. Milk was

88.5% consumed in all schools studied (14) which participated in federal child nutrition programs. Moreover, milk consumption was even higher in the SMP. Consumption averaged 96.5 percent in schools which participated in the SMP but not the NSLP.

The nutritional benefits of the milk provided through the SMP become even more important as federal budget cuts for the NSLP and other child nutrition programs result in: 1) increasing numbers of schools choosing not to participate in the NSLP and 2) increases in lunch prices in schools which still participate in the NSLP. USDA statistics indicate that the number of schools participating in the NSLP decreased by about 1700 schools between April, 1981 and April, 1982 (15). During that period, the average number of children participating in the program on a daily basis dropped by 2.7 million children. The drop in participating children is due not only to the decrease in the number of schools participating but also to increasing lunch prices and other factors. The net effect, however, is that many of these children who no longer participate in the NSLP will eat bag lunches or will eat school lunches in locally-administered lunch programs which may or may not have adequate nutritional standards. Some children may eat no lunch at all. When children do not participate in the NSLP, there is no guarantee that the nutritional value of any lunch they do eat — whether a bag lunch, a lunch served in a local school food program, or otherwise — will be adequate to meet the needs of the children. Milk is not likely to be a part of many bag lunches, and local school lunches served in schools not participating in the NSLP may or may not contain milk. The SMP may be the only source of school milk for many of the 2.7 million children who no longer participate daily in the NSLP as well as millions of other children who have traditionally not participated in the NSLP.

Thus, with the decrease in NSLP participation, the need for the SMP grows. The SMP has traditionally served students in schools with no school lunch service and students who, for whatever reason, choose to eat a bag lunch. Even in 1975, before the SMP was restricted to those schools with no other federal child nutrition program, over eight percent of the schools participating in the SMP (with enrollments totaling 1.86 million children) had no school lunch service. Also in 1975, 43 percent of all SMP milk went to students eating bag lunches (14). These numbers undoubtedly have increased in 1982 and 1983, indicating that the SMP is needed now more than ever to assure that those children who cannot or do not participate in the NSLP consume adequate amounts of the nutrients provided by milk and maintain good health and nutritional status.

A growing need for the SMP has become apparent. Yet in recent years, the scope of the program and its budget have been severely limited. Because the nutritional contribution of milk served through the Special Milk Program is of utmost importance in protecting the nutritional well-being and health of American school children, it is hoped that supporters of the SMP can work together to prevent further cuts in this important program and to restore the SMP in all eligible schools.

REFERENCES

1. Personal communication. USDA, Food and Nutrition Service. March 18, 1983.

2. Food and Nutrition Board, National Academy of Sciences. Recommended Dietary Allowances, 9th ed. 1980. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

3. Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Composition of Foods. Dairy and Egg Products. Raw, Processed, Prepared. Agriculture Handbook No. 8-1. 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

4. Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (HANES II), 1976-1980. Unpublished data.

5. Gallagher, J.C. The absorption of calcium in health and disease. Chapter 9 in: Anghileri, L.J., and A.M. Tuffet-Anghileri, eds. The Role of Calcium in Biological Systems, vol. 2. 1982. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.

6. Allen, L.H. Calcium bioavailability and absorption: a review. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 35 (4): 783-808. April, 1982.

7. Science and Education Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey 1977-78, Preliminary Report No. 2. Food and Nutrient Intakes of Individuals in 1 Day in the United States, Spring 1977. Sept., 1980. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

8. Science and Education Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Food. Home and Garden Bulletin No. 228. 1979. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

9. National Dairy Council. Guide to Good Eating. A Recommended Daily Pattern. 1980. Rosemont, Illinois: National Dairy Council.

10. Jansen, L.R., and J.H. Harper. Consumption and plate waste of menu items served in the National School Lunch Program. J. Am. Diet. Assoc. 71 (4): 395-400. October, 1977.

11. The American Society for Bone and Mineral Research. Osteoporosis. (pamphlet). 1982.

12. Heaney, R.P. Osteoporosis. Chapter 2 in: Bronner, F., and J.W. Coburn, eds. Disorders of Mineral Metabolism, Vol III. 1981. New York: Academic Press.

13. Korcok, M. Add exercise to calcium in osteoporosis prevention. J. Am. Med. Assoc. 247 (8): 1106-1112. Feb 26, 1982.

14. Robinson, J.S. Special Milk Program Evaluation and National School Lunch Program Survey. FNS-167. 1978. Washington, D.C.: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

15. Hiemstra, S.J. Food Program Update. School Food Service J. 36 (8): 78-82. Sept., 1982.